



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/746,619

12/21/2000

Steven D. Woods

7784-000156

1126

65961 7590 06/18/2007
HARNES DICKY & PIERCE, PLC
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2163

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

JUN 18 2007

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/746,619
Filing Date: December 21, 2000
Appellant(s): WOODS ET AL.

Mark D. Elchuk
Erica K. Schaefer
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed April 18, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed November 13, 2006.

Remarks

This supplemental examiner's Answer responds to the supplemental Appeal Brief filed April 18, 2007. The supplemental Appeal was apparently filed to correct items noted in the notice of the defective Brief. As such, this supplemental examiner Answer is offered as a complete response to the supplemental Brief.

All grounds of rejections and arguments remain unchanged.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,389,409	HOROVITZ	5-2002
6,487,545	WICAL	11-2002
6,959,268	MYERS	10-2005

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-20, 22-27 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horovitz et al. (US Patent 6,389,409) in view of Wical (US Patent 6,487,545) and further in view of Myers Jr. et al. (US 6,959,268 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Horovitz discloses a technology management system comprising:

- a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to an individual steward) to populate a card catalog based on collaboration input (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz). Please

Art Unit: 2163

note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received from a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input; and

- Fig. 2 of Horovitz teaches an “Internet site” that is equivalent to a web portal for maintaining a bookshelf of links to entries in the card catalog, the web portal further accessing the bookshelf based on search input catalog (see col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43 and col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz).

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claimed feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to manage the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Horovitz and Wical combination does not disclose generating a notification to a plurality of different users within common or different collaboration groups. Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including identifying any update to product catalog by collaborative group (see col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz and Wical to include the claimed feature as taught by Myers. The motivation

Art Unit: 2163

of doing so would have been to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

Regarding claim 3, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses that the collaboration tool retrieves the collaboration input directly from at least one of the stewards (see col. 7, lines 35-38, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 4, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses that the collaboration tool retrieves the collaboration input from an electronic file, at least one of the stewards placing the collaboration input in the electronic file (see col. 7, lines 35-41, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 5, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses that the collaboration tool converts the collaboration input into metadata, the collaboration input having a corresponding content (see col. 17, lines 17-21, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 6, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses “the category or the input” (col.6, line 36, Horovitz) corresponds to the keyword attribute information, the keyword attribute information defining keywords relating to the content.

Regarding claim 7, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the collaboration tool further converts the technology-specific terminology data into metadata based on the collaboration input (see col. 7, lines 49-67, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 8, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the category or ranks the link of the content that reads on the readiness attribute information, the readiness attribute information defining a readiness for linking of the content to the bookshelf (see col. 7, lines 16-18, Horovitz).

Art Unit: 2163

Regarding claim 9, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the metadata includes steward attribute information, the steward attribute information defining a responsible party for the content. The information about “company A” (Fig.2, Horovitz) corresponds to the steward attribute information.

Regarding claim 10, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the information about “company A” in Fig.2 of Horovitz that reads on author attribute information, the author attribute information defining an author of the content.

Regarding claim 11, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes location attribute information, the location attribute information defining a file location of the content (see col. 6, lines 45-57, Horovitz). Please note that “URL” is the location information defining a file location of the content.

Regarding claim 12, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes notification attribute information, the notification attribute information defining individuals to be notified of the conversion of the collaboration input into metadata (see col. 17, lines 17-21, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 13, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the security attribute information. But, it is obvious to obtain security requirements for accessing the content.

Regarding claim 14, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes date attribute information, the date attribute information defining a conversion date for the collaboration input (see col. 8, lines 46-47, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 15, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the metadata includes title attribute information, the title attribute information defining a title for the content (see col. 6, line 59, Horovitz). “Catalog name” is equivalent to the title of the content.

Regarding claim 16, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the collaboration tool interacts with the card catalog over a networking connection (see Fig.2, Horovitz).

Regarding claims 17 and 20, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the networking connection comprises one of an Internet connection and an intranet connection (see col. 5, lines 32-33, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 19, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the web portal interacts with the card catalog over a networking connection (see col. 5, lines 47-51, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 22. The management system of claim 1 wherein the web portal includes a user interface, the user interface being customizable based on interface input from a user (see col. 3, lines 34-38, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 23, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the user interface includes links contained in the bookshelf (see fig.2 and corresponding text, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 24, Horovitz/Wical/ Myers combination discloses the terminology data relates to airplane technologies (see col. 47, lines 44-65, Wical). “Industry” term is one of many of the terms relate to various aspects of airplane manufacturing and design. Thus, the terminology data relates to aircraft technologies.

Regarding claim 25, Horovitz discloses a method for managing technologies among a plurality of individuals operating within a common collaboration group or within different collaboration groups, the method comprising the steps of: populating a card catalog (col. 5, lines

Art Unit: 2163

47-54, Horovitz) over a networking connection based on collaboration input (col. 6, lines 36-37) from a plurality of independent stewards (col.4, lines 50-62); maintaining a bookshelf of links over the networking connection based on entries in the card catalog (col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz); and accessing the bookshelf based on search input from a user (col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43, Horovitz). Please note that “LinkGraph” corresponds to “card catalog”, “categories page” corresponds to “bookshelf of links”.

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claimed feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to manage the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Horovitz and Wical combination does not disclose generating a notification to a plurality of different users within common or different collaboration groups. Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including identifying any update to product catalog by collaborative group (see col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz and Wical to include the claimed feature as taught by Myers. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

Regarding claim 26, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the steps of storing technology-specific terminology data to a controlled lexicon (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical).

Regarding claim 27, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses the method wherein the stewards and the users are part of an overall enterprise group (col.4, lines 50-62, Horovitz).

Regarding claims 30 and 33, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses wherein the notification data includes an expiration data of the entries (col.1, lines 44-56 and col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers).

Regarding claims 31 and 34, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination discloses wherein the notification data includes employment information of the individual stewards (see col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers).

Regarding claim 32, Horovitz/Wical/Myers combination further discloses converting at least one of the collaboration input and the technology-specific terminology data into metadata the collaboration input having a corresponding content (col.3, line 53 to col.4, line 4, Myers).

Regarding claim 35, Horovitz discloses a technology management system comprising:

- a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to an individual steward) to populate a card catalog based on collaboration input (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz). Please note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received form a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input; and

Art Unit: 2163

- Fig. 2 of Horovitz teaches an "Internet site" that is equivalent to a web portal for maintaining a bookshelf of links to entries in the card catalog, the web portal further accessing the bookshelf based on search input catalog (see col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43 and col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz).

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claimed feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to manage the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Horovitz and Wical combination does not disclose different collaboration groups. Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including different collaborative groups (Fig.1, Fig.8; abstract; summary; col.5, line 35 to col.6, line 30 and col.16, line 1 to col. 17, line 59, Myers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz and Wical to include the claimed feature as taught by Myers. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

(10) Response to Argument

I. Examiner's response to Appellant's argument I:

Appellant argues that “Horovitz appears to disclose a system for obtaining a unifier classification scheme based on pre-existing, multiple on-line catalogs,” (Appellant’s 4/18/07 Brief, page 6) which is different from the claimed invention. “That is, the present system interacts directly with a distributed network of document assets” (Appellant’s 4/18/07 Brief, page 7). Examiner respectfully points out that this limitation is not found in the claimed language.

II Examiner’s response to Appellant’s argument II: the examiner has established a prima-face case of obviousness.

applicant argued in substance that:

(A) Prior Arts would not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention (Appellant’s 4/18/07 Brief, pages 7-15).

As to point (A), in response to applicant’s argument that the references fail to disclose certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the language of the limitations in claim 1 can be given broad and reasonable interpretation. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Horovitz clearly discloses a technology management system comprising a web-based collaboration tool for enabling individual steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to an individual steward) to populate a card catalog based on collaboration input (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67 and col. 5, lines 31-46, Horovitz). Please note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received from a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input.

Horovitz further discloses the modifications of the information on online catalog and a user can access the sought information on the online catalog (see col.2, lines 37-46; col. 3, lines 35-67; col.4, lines 50-62 and col. 5, lines 32-46, Horovitz), in light of the specification page 23, lines 5-8, this teaching reads on the claimed “populate a card catalog.”; and Fig. 2 of Horovitz teaches an “Internet site” that is equivalent to a web portal for maintaining a bookshelf of links to entries in the card catalog, the web portal further accessing the bookshelf based on search input catalog (see col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43 and col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz).

In the related catalog art, Wical discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on the claimed a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data.

In another related catalog art, Myers discloses product catalog for use in a collaborative engineering environment including identifying any update to product catalog by collaborative group and a notification of changing (updating) the information on the catalog (see col.16, lines 1-6 and col. 17, lines 15-25, Myers) reads on the claimed a notification device that provides at least one of the single collaboration group and the more than one collaboration group with notification data entries on the catalog.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Horovitz, Wical and Myers to derive the invention as claimed because it would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to manage the multiple information resources and update (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz) and to provide the users cooperative capabilities of sharing information over the enterprise network.

(B) The applicant argued that the combination of the references would not suggest to one skilled in the art to obtain the claimed invention (Appellant's 1/16/07 Brief, pages 10-11).

As to point (B), Examiner believes that the motivation was given above to combine Horovitz, Wical and Myers is sufficient. In addition, Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Moreover, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of one reference may be bodily incorporated into the other reference to produce the claimed subject matter but simply what the references make obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Art Unit: 2163

Hanh Thai

February 5, 2007

Conferees:

Hanh Thai



Examiner, AU 2163

Don Wong



Supervisory Patent Examiner, AU 2163

DON WONG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Tim Vo



Supervisory Patent Examiner, AU 2168

TIM VO

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100